

OF IDOLATRY.

Περὶ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας ἢ τῶν λαλῶντων καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι διακρινέσθαι



OXFORD,
Printed by HENRY HALL, Printer to
the *Univerſitie*. 1646.



fer
an

fir
ta
ing
tu
spe
is,
go
an

not
ld
no
32.

Gr
red
C
hu
tin
tra

is
(Ia
tion
som
tua
and
from

OF IDOLATRY.



§ 1. S the Judgements of other men have perswaded me to think it pertinent and seasonable to adde this one unto foure former disquisitions, with which it holds some analogie and cognation; So the nature of the enquiry hath prompted and directed me to take rise (as those former have done) from the examination of the word, and that by observing the *origination* first, and then *Criticall* peculiar importance of it among *ancient* writers, those especially of the *Scripture*.

To that end the word *Εἰδωλον*, *Idol*, of which it is compounded, must first be viewed. And of that there is no question, but that in the literall notation of it, it signifies an *Image* or *representation* of any kind, and accordingly in the *Old Testament* is set to expresse both *הַצֵּלֶם* an *image*, or *similitude*, any kind of figure in *generall*; and *פֶּסֶל* a *carved* or *graven image* in *specie*, a statue of wood or stone, any kind of *Sculpture*; Though the truth is, *Εἰδωλον* is not the most ordinary rendring of either of these, but *εἰκὼν* *image* of the former, and *Εἰδωλον* but twice, and *γλυπτὴν* *sculptile* of the latter, and *Εἰδωλον* but thrice.

Three words there are to which it is most ordinarily applied, 1. *אֵלִים* a *nothing* that hath no being, (to which Saint Paul referres when he saith *an Idol is nothing*) or if you please a no God, *אֵל אֵל* that hath no *Divinity*, no power to help the Client or Worshiper; parallel to that passage, *Deut.* 32. *they have provoked me אֵל כִּי אֵין* with that which is no God.

Secondly, *אֱלֹהִים* *Gods*, the many false *Gods* of the heathens, by the Greek seven times rendred *Εἰδωλα* *Idols*, unless perhaps it may be conjectured, that they which so rendred it in those places, mistook, or misread *אֱלֹהִים* *Gods* (which in other places they constantly render *θεοί*, at least two hundred times) for *אֵלִים* *nothings*, vanities, which is very near in writing and sound unto it, and such mistakes are no great news in those translatours.

Thirdly, *נִרְיָה* *Pollution*, filth by which any man is contaminated; This is rendred sometimes *βδέλυγμα* *abomination*, but more frequently *Εἰδωλον* (*Idol*) then any thing else, which certainly referres not onely to the *pollution* of the Soul by the commission of that sinne (for by every other sinne some pollution is contracted) nor onely to that other notion of spiritual fornication, but principally to the abominable sinnes of *uncleanness*, and *filthinesse*, which those *Idol worships* were ordinarily guilty of, and from thence received a great aggravation and heighning of their guilt, and

punishment. And to the same purpose the word *ῥυψή* *abomination*, or filthiness, (and so most commonly rendred *ββλυγμα*, and *μίασμα*) is sometimes *ἱδωλόν* *Idol* also.

§ 6. Other words there are, that sometimes (but more rarely) are thus rendred also, as *במה* (from whence the Greek *βωμῶν*) *high places*, the Altars or Temples of their false Gods peculiarly, (as may appear *1 Macc. 1. 62.* where *βωμὸς* the Heathen Altar was by *Antiochus* set upon the *βουσαῖον* or Altar of the Jews) and these would be more properly rendred *ἱδωλῶνα*, *Idol Temples*, or altars, then *ἱδωλῶνα* *Idols*, and therefore perhaps in that one place *Ezek. 16. 16.* where it is rendred *ἱδωλῶνα*, it may be a false print, for *ἱδωλῶνα*, I am sure our English most properly renders it *high places*, and those are called *ἱδωλῶνα* not onely by the authour of that book *1 Macc. 1. 50.* but by Saint *Paul* himself, *1 Cor. 8. 1.* speaking of him that eateth in *ἱδωλῶν* in a Temple or other place where those false Deities were worshipped.

§ 7. Secondly, *הבל* *vanitie*, from whence it is that the Gentile-Idol worshipers under the title of [*πάντες ἄνθρωποι*] all men, the generalitie of mankind (or all the world but the Jews) are said to be *φύσει ἰδωλῶν*, *Wisd. 13. 1.* *vain* or *Idolatrous by Nature*, that is, either by *birth* born in that Idolatrous age among those Heathens; or else by *long, popular, nationall, accustomed custome*, which is, saith *Galen*, *ἐκκλιτὸς φύσει* *an acquired nature*; Thus hath *Suidas* interpreted the word *φύσει* *nature*, that it is sometimes *χρονία καὶ παντοῦ συνήθεια*. *a chronicaill evil custome*, and instances in that place where Saint *Paul* tells the *Ephesians* chap. 2. 3. that they had been by *nature the children of wrath*, (as *υἱοὶ ὀργῆς* *children of wrath*, signifies peculiarly Gentiles, so) the *prime* if not *onely* intent of that adjunct *φύσει* is (as many circumstances in the context will convince) that they were such Idolatrous Gentiles, either *φύσει* *by birth*, (born such Gentile worshipers, *οἱ ὡς οἱ λοιποὶ* *as the rest also* of the Heathen world was) or else *φύσει*, *by custome*, by long popular habit of education, or (which will unite both those senses, and more fully expresse the word *φύσει* from *φύω*) by a *long habit* deduced from their very first *being* or *birth*, and so continuing till the time of their conversion; *customary Idolaters, walking κατὰ τὴν αἰῶνα τὸ νότον τότε, according to the age or vicious custome of the Heathen World*, vers. 2. and the practices of the *υἱοὶ ἀπειθείας*, *infidels* or *unbelievers*. And so will the word be best rendred, when the same Apostle expostulates with the *Corinthians*, *1 Cor. 11.* and demands whether *φύσει* (we render *nature*) did not tell them, that it was a *shame for a man κομᾶν*, which we render to *wear long hair*, but I conceive, would more properly (according to the use of the word in the Greek authours) be translated to *let the hair grow at length*. If either of the

Interpre-

Interpretations be accepted, then sure *ῥύσις* must onely signifie the *custome* and *fashion* of the *place*, or of the generality of men, or else birth, as that containeth in it the distinction of sexes, or in the mixt sense, an universall continued custome from their birth till then; and not *nature* in the ordinary acception, or as it signifies the *law of nature* written in our hearts. For then not onely *Absaloms hair* must be against *nature*, (which yet the Scripture charges not with that crime) but even the *vow* and practise of *Samson* and the *Nazarites*, had been an *unnaturall* sinne. A later Critick would have *κομὰν* be taken for *braiding of hair*, or making a *dress*ing of it (which I confesse the *Apostles* argument in that place, and the mention of *μεσολαβιον*, a *covering*, would perswade) but then still *ῥύσις* must signifie (though not onely a *locall*, yet) an *universall custome*, such as hath designed and fitted *distinction of attires* to *distinction of sexes*, which it would be hard to impute to the dictate of *nature* in every mans heart, so that that should be thought to define what attire is naturall to a *man*, what to a *woman*, but is an act either of *locall custome*, *συμβίβη*, (which in this matter the *Apostle* appeals to, vers. 16. against all disputers) or else of *universall custome* of all nations, which he seems to plead in this place. But I conceive it without example in Authours sacred, or heathen, that *κομὰν* should signifie a *dress*ing, (whatsoever *νομῖς* and other words of some affinity may be thought to do.) The notion which at first I gave you will satisfie all pretensions both of the Grammarian and the Textuary, that it signifie to *let the hair grow at length without cutting or poling it*, that will satisfie the Critick, for that is *κομὰν comam promittere*, and to do so, there can be little reason assigned, unlesse it be in order to *braiding* it, or making a covering of it, on occasion of which it is that the *Apostle* here saith, that it is an *honourable* or *decent* thing for a woman to do so, vers. 15. (and the contrary for a man) and *not to do so is all one for her, as to be shorn or shaven*, vers. 5. and 6. and so that satisfies the Textuary also.

But this by the way, from this acception of the word *הבלי* *vanity*, for *idols*, it is that *Rom. 1. 21.* Saint Paul saith of the heathen, that *ἀμαρτανίζοντες they became vain*, that is, fell to those impious *idol-worships*.

Thirdly, *בעלים* *Lords or husbands* (or as we retain the Hebrew word in *English*, *Baalim*) 2 *Chron. 17. 3.* *Jer. 9. 15.* is rendered in the *Greek* again *ἰδωλά, idols*, and so clearly signifies those other heathen *deities* taken into a rivalry with the *God* of heaven.

Fourthly, *חמנים* we render it the *Sun-images* in the margin, *Es. 17. 8.* but whosoever considers the place, and *Ezek. 6. 4.* will acknowledge that it signifies (not the *images*, but) the *places* of worship of *המה* that is, the *Sun*, called by the *Greeks* *πυρρία* & *πυραδρία*, the *places where the sacred*

fres were made in honour to the *Sunne*, and the word is therefore by the *Targum* rendred, *Isai.* 17. 8. חֲסִנְסִיָּא *delubra, temples*, (a description of which is given us by *Benjamin* in his *Itinerary*, and by some of the *Rabbins*, affirmed to have been first of a religious institution to God in thanksgiving for that glorious creature) these I say are once rendred εἰδωλα, *idols*, *Isai.* 27. 9. but in other places *τεῖνον, temples, &c.*

§ 10. Fifthly, the word חָלִי (farre enough naturally from any such signification) is rendred *Ezek.* 36. 18. εἰδωλα, *idols*, and our *English* from thence have continued that rendring [*our idols*] where yet I conceive the *Hebrew* should be translated [*their actions or inventions*] (the word properly denoting any good or evil *work* or *enterprize*) and the *Greek* rendring may possibly have been a *mistake* of the *Hebrew* חָלִי for חָלָה (from which before we had חָלָה for *idols*) and then it will be the same in our *English* also.

§ 17. Sixthly, the word, עֵצָה that signifies any *cause of grief, of toyl, of frightfull passions*, is often rendred εἰδωλον, noting again their heathen *Gods*, which used their clients exceeding ill, the *dæmones, demons*, the *fear* and dread of whom produced the *Greek* word which we render *Superstition*, And near of kin unto that, is a seventh מַפְלֵצָה which once is rendred εἰδωλον also, and from the origination of the word is justly rendred [*horroürs*] in our *Marg.* 2 *Chron.* 15. 16.

§ 12. Once more the word תְּרָפִים *Teraphim*, those which *Rachel* stole from *Laban*, are rendred εἰδωλα, *idols*, also, and seem to have been some *images* (τύποι θεῶν, saith *Josephus, images of his Gods*) but as others guess, *images set to a certain position of the Starres*, with the figures of the *planets* upon them according to the custome of the *Syrians* then, by which they were wont to divine; not any thing like the *Cup*, whereby say the *Egyptians* of *Joseph*, he divineth, for that I conceive was but a *drinking cup*, wherein he used to drink in those *sacrifices* by which he prepared to receive *presages* from God, (and therefore I should render those words *Gen.* 44. 5. [*with which he receiveth presages*] but *Astrologically instruments*, with pictures of *Starres* upon them, which some conceive to have been so made, that they were able to speak sometimes, and then they will differ but little from the *Sun-idols* even now mentioned, for those they say, by the operation of the fire, became *vocall*.

§ 13. This so particular wearisome trouble have I given the Reader at the entrance, to give him occasion of observing that the word εἰδωλον, *idol*, though it signifie an *image*, or *sculpture*, or *representation* sometimes, yet it signifies somewhat else besides that, particularly these two things, 1. the *Heathen Gods* under the notion of *false* (together with the *Temples* wherein they were worshiped) 2. The same again, and their worship under the

notions of *filthy, unclean, and abominable*. Which two notions of the word (that we may proceed a step further) we shall now look on, as they were in order to worship, and that will open to us some entrance to a view of idolatry, or the worship of idols what it is.

For the former, the *worshiping of false Gods, and images*, I shall give you a brief narration of it out of the soberest of the *Jewish* writers, *Maimonides l. 1. de Idololatria.* § 14.

The first rise of Idolatry is, saith he, to be referred to the dayes of Enoch, when men (taking notice how God had created the Starres and Sphears for the government of the world, and by placing them in so eminent a state seemed to mak them partakers of his honour, and used them as his Ministers and Officers) resolved it their duty to laud, and extoll, and honour them, and taught others that this was the will of God, that we should magnifie and worship those whom he had preferred and dignified (as a King would have his Ministers honoured) and that that is the honouring of God. Upon this foundation saith he, they began to build Temples to the Starres, to sacrifice to them, bow themselves before them, that by so doing they might obtain Gods favour, and this was the ground of Idolatry, not that they thought there was no God but the Starres, but that they thought this worship performed to them to be the will of God. In proceſſe of time false Prophets arose, pretending messages from God, and directions for the worshiping of such or such a Starre, nay for the sacrificing to all the host of them, building them Temples, making pictures of them that might be adored by women, children, and all others; and to that purpose they invented certain figures, affirming them to be revealed to them by propheſie, to be the images of such Starres. Thereupon men began to make images in Temples, under trees, on the top of hills, and all men to meet and worship them, resolving and proclaiming that from those images all good and evil did proceed, and therefore in all reason they were to be feared and worshiped; the Priests promising all increase and prosperity as the reward of this worship, and prescribing of rules for the performance of it. After these, other impostours rose, that affirmed such a Starre, or Sphear, or Angel, to have spoken to them, and prescribed their way and manner of worship; in summe, it was generally spread over the world, that images were to be worshiped, each by a peculiar manner of sacrifice, and adoration, and the name of God was quite lost out of the mouth and minds of all men; so farre as not to be acknowledged by them, but all sorts of people worshiped nothing but images of wood and stone, built temples on purpose for them, adored and swore by their name, and even the Priests and wise men among them thought that there was no other God but those starres, &c. for whose sakes these images were made.

made. As for the great God of this world no mortall knew him, save onely Henoch, Methulalah, Noah, Sem and Heber, and so it continued till Abraham was born, the pillar of the world. Thus much Maimon. and much more by way of story and observation. And what is thus by him observed of the heathens, is by others deduced as clearly for the idolizing of Kings and great persons, ἀνθρώποις ὡς θεοῖς δαυμαζόμενοι, men admired by their flatterers saith Chrysostome: which besides the testimony of Wisd. 14. 17. and Aristotle Met. 1. (where he shews how admiration of great men and benefactors hath been the great principle of idolatry or men-worship) is every where observable in the story of the Romane Cesars, no man dying without an ἑορτασμός, or being made a God; and then constantly the setting up of their statues in their Temples, following as an attendant of it.

§ 15.

Many Stages you see in this accursed progresse of idol-worship, before they came to images, and that last so prodigious a pitch, such a dishonouring of the deity, that the Psalmist could not say any thing more reprochfull of the makers of them, and trusters in them, then that they were ἰσοῖς, like or equall to their Gods.

§ 16.

To this purpose there are three notable passages which I shall but mention, and leave to be view'd at large; the one Isai. 44. 13. to the twentieth verse; and the other, Wisd. 13. 11. and so to the end of that Chapter; the third, in the Epistle of Jeremy, shewing the ridiculous progresse of a knotty piece of wood into a solemn deity, and the irrational senselesse-ness of that worship, even in the judgement of Heathens themselves, witnesse Heraclitus, Ὁμοῖα, ὡς ἐῖς τις τοῖς θεοῖς λαλοῦντες οὐτο, παύσαν ὅτι ἀκούοντες ὡς θεοὶ τοῖς ἀψύχοις, praying to inanimate things is like talking to houses; And yet this madness the constant disease of those that had set up any other deity but that of the onely true God of heaven, that ever adored any creature, παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, Rom. 1. (not onely more, as we render it, but) besides or except the Creator; There being no stay for those (that became thus vain to worship any thing but God) no stop in their tumbling (as Maimon. phrases it) to that deep gulf of impietie, the worship of the most inanimate mean creatures in the world.

§ 17.

The truth is, Maximus Tyrus gives a more favourable ingenious account of this matter, Dial. 29. That as letters were invented for the expressing of words, (that so by the help of writing, the weaknesse of mens memories might be repaired) so the images of the Gods were provided to help the infirmities of men, in which they may lay up the names of their Gods, καὶ τοῖς φημὸς αὐτοῖς, and the famous things that are worth remembring of them, and in brief to help them to celebrate their Gods as they ought, as so many ἐμνησκαι καὶ παραμύθια εἰς ἀνάμνησιν, help and manuductions for remembrance,

brance, and *σύμβολα τῆς τῶν Θεῶν τιμῆς*, *signes and tokens of their honouring them*, Trophies as it were of their Noble acts to perpetuate the memory of them. So that although, as he acknowledges, God be invisible to eyes, yet in respect of our infirmity, and again of the nature of Lovers to love, to behold their pictures whom they love, it will not be amisse to use anything that may thus bring us in mind of God, and all this with a caution, that nothing be terminated in the picture, but the love, and remembrance, and everything bestowed upon God onely. This is a piece of Heathen divinity very handsomely managed, being indeed no pretence of plea for the worshipping of Images, but onely the using them as helps to perform our duty to God; But it is no news to see the actions of the many, and the writings of the few very unlike one the other. (it being very easie to write virtuously, and hard to live so.) And certainly the Heathen practice was quite another thing then this Platonick speculation; and so much of the first and second notion of an Idol.

Now for the other notion of an Idol, as it signifies filthy or abominable, § 18. it will be worth observing, what the Author of the book of Wisdom saith of it in *universum*, *Wisd.* 14. where after an enumeration of many other wickednesses in their *τελεῖαι & μυστήρια*, vers. 23. in their *inhumane sacrifices and mysteries*, he concludes with *μίανσις, γυνήτων ἐραδία γῆ, γάμου δ' ἄταξια, πορνεία & ἀσέλγεια* pollution, inversion of nature, disorder of marriage, adultery, and shamelesse uncleanness, vers. 26. and at length concludes that the worshipping of the namelesse Idols, or those not to be named, is the beginning, and cause, and end of evil; all the villanies in the world the designe and specification of those worships.

To that purpose that I may not lead my reader into the Heathen stories, or the relations made by the Fathers in those tracts which they wrote against the Gentiles, (that excellent * set of bookes, which may serve any student for the *Isthmus*, or *ἠδυσσεύς*, or passage between the study of humane and divine learning) I shall onely point to some passages in the sacred writ that look this way. 1. *Kings* 14. 24. after the mention of the Idols and groves follows that there were Sodomites in the Land, doing according to the abominations of the Heathen, which the Lord had cast out before the children of Israel, which gives you moreover a view of the particularity of the sinne of the Amorites and other Nations, which provoked God to that fatall slaughter, and eradication of them, which is more fully set down, *Levit.* 18. 24. 25. 27. 28. and an expresse threat added from Heaven, vers. 29. that *whosoever shall commit any of these abominations shall be cut off from among their people*.

And perhaps it will not be unworthy a digression here to mark, that at § 19.

§ 19.
* Orig. con.
Cels. 7. st.
Mar. Apol.
Clem. Al.
Theop. ad
Autol. Tat.
Theod.
Barnab. 2.
Euseb. Prep.
Euseb. Cypr.
Alex. con.
Iulian. cont.
Tertul. A.
Apol. Minat.
Felix.
Arnobius.
Lactantius.
Aug. de Ci.
uit. Dei.
Firmicus.

the *rooting* out of those *Nations*, and the *planting* in of the *Jews* in their stead, by way of *Covenant*, the condition of that *Covenant* being that they should *fear the Lord*, and *not walk in the ways of those Nations*) the *signe* or *seal* of that *Covenant* was designed to be such as had a particular reference to these *sinnes* of the *flesh*, and denoted the *amputation* of the *superfluity* of *naughtinesse*, which had been practised among those *Gentiles*, and which would infallibly bring as certain *excision* upon them, (if they reformed it not) as was threatened by God to every *male Israelite* that should continue *uncircumcised*. To the same purpose were all those *laws* and *writes* concerning *legall pollutions*, to bring them to the greatest *alienation* of mind, and *detestation* of this piece of *Heathenisme*; Yea and one main part of the *promise* of God upon their obedience, viz. the *multiplying of their seed* (which was so remarkable in that *Nation*, that *Josephus* mentions *ἡ ἀνὰ τὸν χρόνον ἀύλησις*, as the *craft* as it were, and special peculiar *excellency* of that people) was a most naturall proper effect of the *abstaining* from those *sinnes*, and it is as clear that in our *Christian Sacrament* of *Initiation*, the *ἀποβαλεῖς τὰ ὀνόματα σαρκὸς*, the *washing away the sordes of the flesh*, had a propriety also to that, (which is accordingly mentioned in the vow of baptism, *the forsaking of all the sinfull lusts* thereof.) but this by the way.

§ 21. So again, chap. 15. 12. the *Idols* and the *Sodomites* are mentioned together, and 2. Kings 23. 7. *the houses of the Sodomites are cast down*; where there is also mention of the *groves* for those *dark* purposes, by which under that name of *אֲשֶׁרֶת Astarta* seems to be designed. So when the *Babylonians* made *Succoth Benoth*, what is meant thereby but the *Tents of Venus*, in which all the *Virgins* were solemnly prostituted to the honour of that *false deity Venus*, under the title of *Mylistta*? and so the *prostitution* of their *daughters* for the honour of their *gods*, which is mentioned not only by *Herod. l. 1.* and *Strabo l. 16.* but in the *Epistle of Jeremy* vers. 43. where the *cords* mentioned are undoubtedly the *signes* of their *vows* (and obligation from thence) to pay that sacrifice before they went. So *Isa. 57. 5.* *Inflaming, or you that inflame your selves with Idols under every green tree*] noting that prostitution of men and women in the *Groves* about their *Idol-temples*, in honour of their *false gods*. And to instance in no more, it seems not improbable upon these grounds that the frequent expressions of the *Idolatrous* practises of the *Jews* by *fornication*, *whoring* and the like, may be somewhat more than a *trope* or figure of *Rhetorick*, having thus much of *Reality* in it also: It being clear that this falling off to the *Heathen Idols* brought them off to these *Heathen sinnes* also; as in the matter of *Baal-Peor* it is most evident. So *Rom. 1. 26.* it is affirmed of the *Gentiles*

tiles that as a punishment of those *Idol-beathen-worships* God gave them up *εις ατιμίαν* to dishonourable infamous afflictions, and a particular account of them is set down, vers. 26. *women changing the naturall use*, &c. and likewise men also *αἰσχροσύνην καὶ ἡρπαζόμενοι* vers. 27. and *πεινῶν τὰ μηρὰ καὶ ἐνὶ καρτῇ* vers. 28. guilty of those *most reprochfull shames, and contumelies of nature*. Of which there was abundant store in the *Eleusinia sacra, Cybeles mysteries, Venus, and Floras feasts*, from which it will not be tolerable to repeat them.

By this ungratefull unfavoury observation it will be possible to contribute somewhat to the illustrating of many places in the *New Testament*, and particularly of the notion of Idolatry there, (for which advantage it is that this discourse hath thus enlarged it self.) As first, *Eph. 4. 29* where speaking of the *Gentiles*, he saith *ἵπτες ἀμαρηνώτες* (that is, in *Hesychius's* Glossary) who * *giving over all labour*, (as idleness is the mother-sinne of the *Sodomites*) *gave themselves up to lasciviousnesse, to work all uncleannesse* *ἐς πλεονεξίαν*, we render it, [*with greedinesse*] the word is interpreted *Covetousnesse* in other places, but signifies not onely that, but all *immoderate*, and pecularly inordinate unnaturall desire, not onely *coveting* of wealth, I say, but in *Aristotle* any thing that is opposed *ἐν ὀλίῳ* to equality, when any man will have (*πλεονέξει*) above his portion. So in *Hesychius* *πλεονεξία τὸ πλεον τῷ δέοντι ἐν ἑνὶ λαμβάνειν*, to denote the [*more then is due or ought to be*] whatsoever the subject matter be. So in *Lucian de calumni*: pag. 844. the *Calumniator* is described to be *one that will have all his auditours to himself, will let no man else be heard*, and for this he calls him *πλεονεκτὴν*, and so *Democrates* in his *γρῆμα*, defines *πλεονεξία* to be a *speaking all, and not endureing to hear any body else*: And the notion that I now speak of, applied to *inordinate lust*, though it differ in the object, is the same in effect with this, a desiring and usurping, that which is not agreeable to his condition sex, nature, &c. and of that we have a grammaticall ground in the *Hebrew* word *בָּצַע* which signifies *covetousnesse* and *lust*, and being oft rendred *πλεονεξία* is once rendred *μιασμός* *pollution*, *Ezekiel 33. 31.* where though our *English* read *covetousnesse*, yet the sense directs otherwise, even to that which vers. 29. is exprest by *abominations*. Of this I should not thus define, were not many places of the *New Testament* eminently applyable to this sense, nor thus farre extravagante on this word, did it not much tend to the explaining and asserting the *New Testament* notion of *Idolatry* that now we are upon.

In that *Rom. 1. 29.* you have together in this matter *περεια, πορνεία, πλεονεξία, κακία*, *fornication. villany, (not covetousnesse again. but) inordinate desire and naughtinesse*, and yet more evidently, *Coloss. 3. 5.* where

speaking of the *Gentile unbelievers*, among their deeds that a Christian is so carefully to avoid, the *Apostle* mentions *fornication*, *uncleanness*, *πῦδος* (I conceive, in *Salvians* phrase) *passivity*, *evil concupiscence* and *πλεονεξία*, sure *inordinate desire* again which is *Idolatry* (and this seems to me to have been acknowledged by *Saint Cyprian*, who *Ep. 52.* will have [*sinne*, which] referre to each of those foregoing names) the interpretation of that heathen worship of theirs, for which the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience (it seems again this was the sinne that brought that fatall destruction upon them) ἐν οἷς, in which sinnes the *Colossians* had sometimes walked when they lived ἐν αἰσῶσι, among the *Gentiles*. So *Eph. 5. 3.* let neither *fornication*, nor *uncleanness*, or *πλεονεξία*, *inordinate desire* be named among you, (those nefanda, sinnes not to be named) as becomes *Saints*, as they are opposed to *Gentiles* again. And so verse 5. Every fornicatour, and unclean person, and *πλεονεξίης*, (not covetous, but inordinate luster) who is an *Idolator*.

- § 24. This may possibly be the notation of *Idolaters* also, when the *Apostle* saith, *1 Cor. 10. 6.* Be not ye *Idolaters*, as were some of them, as it is written, they sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play. For the Greek *παίζω*, which we render to play, may possibly referre in that place to those sinnes of *uncleanness*. It is clear that *παίζω* doth *Gen. 39. 14.* and *17.* which we there render [*mock*] and though *παίζω* be not the word there used, yet the Hebrew *חָנַן* signifies both, and is the word used both in that place of *Genesis*, and *Exod. 32. 6.* from whence our *Apostle* cites it; and if comparing the story *Acts 7. 41.* (where it is said in this matter, *ἐυοχαριστοῦντες*, they rejoiced in the works of their hands) be apt to perswade any, that *παίζω* to play, is all one with *εὐοχαριστάω* to rejoice, and so that both denote their dancing before their *Idol* it will be as obvious to reple to that *εὐοχαριστάω* there used, signifies most properly the rejoicing at a feast *Luke 12. 19.* and *15. 23. 24. 29. 32.* and *16. 19.* and so following, the offering of sacrifice to their idol, shall denote a sacrificall feast, and be all one with the eating and drinking here, but not with the playing that attends it: and so still the *παίζω* may probably be thus interpreted; especially when in this place it follows immediately after *ἐκτινέμεναι κακὰ* lusters after evil things, and is attended with *οὐδε πορνεύετε*, neither let us commit fornication. &c. and from thence perhaps it is that verse 14. to his exhortation of flying from *Idolatry*, he subjoyns verse 15. *I speak to wise men, judge what I say*; not willing to adde more words on that subject. This is but a conjecture of which I am not confident. But no question, this is the meaning of *αἰδέμενοι τὰς ἀβυσσολατρείας*, the abominable nefarious *Idolatries*, *1 Pet. 4. 3.* of the fruitlesse works of darknesse, whereof *Christianitie* made them ashamed of the *χρυσὴν γυναικίαν*, those

§ 15. To this nothing can more clearly belong, then that mention of *Idolaters*, 1 Cor. 6. 9. being so joyned on both sides with *fornicatours*, *adulterers*, *soft or effeminate defilers of themselves with mankind*. And what if the phrase ὁ βδελυσνύμενος εἰδωλά, Rom. 2. 22. do so also, [thou that abhorrest Idols] The word βδελυσνύμενος seems to referre to those (so frequently called) βδελύγματα, *abominations*; whether (those of the *Sydonians*, and the like, that is, whether) *abominable sacrifices*, killing, and offering their *sonnes and daughters unto devils*, or *abominable forceries*, Deut. 18. or *abominable senselesse stupidity*, in worshipping inanimate creatures, or *abominable lusts in their idol-seasts*, I shall not now define, but onely observe, that if we should applie it peculiarly to the last of these (yet not excluding the rest) the rationall importance of the place will bear it very well. Thou that dost so detest and abominate those heathen villanies in their idol-worships, if upon that ground of zeal thou robbe and ristle their Temples, wilt never be able to clear thy self.

§ 16. Having gone through so many, there are but few more mentions of these words [*Idolater or Idolatry*] in the New Testament, I shall briefly give you a view of them, Gal. 5. 20. Where of the *works of the flesh*, carnall finnes there are in the Front, *Adultery*, *fornication*, *uncleanness*, ἀσέλγεια (that foul sinne, which our Translation renders here *lasciviousnesse*, but elikewhere *shamelesse uncleanness*, Wisd. 14. 26. *Idolatry*, &c. all clearly of a making, if this notion of *Idolatry* be accepted. So Apoc. 21. 8. where among the eight severalls, to which the *fire and brimstone* old *Sodom's* lot, is apportioned, you will find these five *unbelievers* (a generall word for *Gentiles*) ἐβδελυσνύμενοι (we render it *abominable*, it is most probably in that place, and in that conjunction those that have been guilty of those βδελύγματα, *abominations*, or bestiall finnes, as Apoc. 17. 4. you have βδελύγματα καὶ ἀναδάρτητα τῆς πορνείας, the *abomination and uncleanness of her fornication*, and so verse 7. *fornicatours*, and *idolaters*, and all *liars*, (that is, I conceive all that are guilty of those *false idolatrous worships*) and so again, chap. 22. 15. *Fornicatours*, *Idolaters*, and every one that loveth and worketh a lie, (all those that delight in, and practise those *false worships*, which are called a lie, Rom. 1. 25.) and *φαρμακοὶ forcerers* in the front, either because that sinne was so ordinarily joyned to those other heathen impieties, (as may appear by one eminent place, Deut. 18. from the ninth to the thirteenth verse) or upon a ground, which I shall have occasion to mention anon, of *conjuring their Gods by magicall ceremonies*, (γυνταῖς and *φαρμακείαις*) to adjoyn themselves to the *consecrated images*. And all this under the title of the *dogs that are without*, that is, the *Gentile world of Idolatours*.

* Ἀσέλγεια, ἀ-
σελγής, ἄ-
σελγής, ἄ-
σελγής,
Hefych.

Thus

Thus in some Latine fragments of Polycarpus's Epistle speaking of Valens a Presbyter of Philippi, and his having committed somewhat utterly unworthy of that calling (which is *not* there named, and perhaps by that may be rather guessed at what it was) by his example he admonisheth others to abstain [ab avaritia] (that sure was in Greek, *ἀπὸ φιλοψυχίας*) from inordinate desires, [& sint casti] and be chaste. Adding, that whosoever did not thus abstain [οὐκ ἀποφύγουσιν φιλοψυχίας] ab idolatria coinquinabitur, & tanquam inter Gentes iudicabitur, will be contaminated by Idolatry, and shall be judged as among the Gentiles.

I have now sufficiently importuned and tempted my readers patience with these observations, which might be thought very extrinsecall to the matter in hand (especially as farre as concerns the word *φιλοψυχία*) but that they tend immediately (to which I designed them) to that third and main importance of the word [Idol in the Old Testament; and more then so, to the explication of the word Idolatry (and by the way, of many difficult passages) in the New, so as to signifie those Heathen basenesses, that Christians were too apt to learn from the Gentiles, when their Image-worship was lesse tempting to them, and may therefore possibly be the vice, from which the Apostle to dehort his little children, that is, his new born babes in Christ or Gentile converts, that they abstain or keep themselves from Idols, 1 John 5. 21. for there was (as farre as we read in Scripture) little of any other kind of Idolatry in fashion among Christians at that time (unlesse perhaps the eating the *ἑὶς ὁλβίου* may come under that title which yet Saint Paul prohibits onely in order to Scandall) and that this was, not onely slyly and secretly (but even avowedly and profestly) you may see 2 Pet. 2. which Chapter being read and weighed in the Originall, will appear to be almost wholly spent on this matter. I will give the Reader a little light to it.

There was it seems a villanous sect of false teachers ready to creep in among those Christians, verse 1. bringing in *ἀρετῆς ἀπωλείας* doctrines of destruction; you will guesse what that means, if you mark what some ancient copies set in stead of that word which we render [destruction.] when it returns again vers. 2. for there the old manuscripts have *ἀπαργείας* wantonnesses, in stead of *ἀπωλείας* destructions. Our English reads *damnable heresies* in the first place, and *pernicious wayes* in the second, but those are onely generally paraphrases which come not home particularly to the notation of the word, and therefore the margin of our books confessing that other reading, renders it vers. 2. *lascivious wayes*, in the sense that now we contend for. This is further explined (which convinces the discourse to belong to this matter) by the *sinnes of the old world*, vers. 5. and of *Sodom* peculiarly,

* Codex am.
sig. in Coll.
Magd. Ox.

peculiarly, verse 6. by the ἀδελφεὶς ἐν ἀσέλγεια ἀναγορῇ. verse 7. the *conversation* of those that observed no laws in their lasciviousness, such as did so grieve righteous Lot in Sodom, by ἐμδυσμία μασμῶ *lust of pollution* or *abominable desire*, verse 10. by γεννηθῆναι εἰς ἀλωπυ, καὶ σφραγίσθαι. verse 12. we render it [*born to be taken and destroyed*] but it signifies rather in the active sense, that *are made adpradandum* to prey, (or catch and tear, so Job 24. 5. לטרף by the Greek rendred εἰς ἀλωπυ to catch, is in the Chaldee paraphrase *rising up early to their prey*) and to corrupt, that is, good for nothing but to assault and debauch (as ravenous beasts do use to prey upon) all they meet with promiscuously; and it is observable that the word טרפה *prey* or *carcass* which properly signifies those things which are taken and torn with wild beasts, (because such were not to be eaten * Lev. 17. 15.) is by use enlarged to all forbidden meats among the Rabbins (it the lungs of any thing have a hole in them, they call it טרפה &c. faith * Elias Levita) and so by analogy is here made use of to denote those *unclean* prohibited acts, which are so to be accounted of among Christians, as the *cibus veritus* among the Jews, and therefore it follows, that those that take pleasure in that γυμνὰ, such riotous actions as these verse 13. are called σπύλοι and μώμοι from the Hebrew מים *macula, spots and blemishes*, (such as among the Jews made the sacrifice *unclean*) defilers and polluters of those, with whom they do συναδω γυμνὰ feast or revell, in the end of that verse. So it is again expressed verse 14. by *having eyes full of the adulteresse*, and that cease not from sinne, intangling, unstable or unconfirmed Souls, that is, new converted Christians, having a heart γυμνασμένην πλενεζίας (in the sense which before we gave of the word, and which belongs to it also verse 3.) *exercised with those inordinate lusts*, that is, wholly employed on them; which denominates them τέκνα καταρας *children of a curse*, that is, *worthy* to have a curse fall on them (as the *Sonne of perdition* worthy to be destroyed) And ver. 15. by the way of Balaam (who we know brought the Israelites to that sinne of uncleanness with the Moabitish women, and to the curse by that means) by ὑπεργαλατισμῶς verse 18. that *high pitch of vanity*, or false Idolatrous worship, as a snare to bring men to the ἐμδυσμία σαρκὸς, ἀσέλγειαι &c. *lusts of the flesh, lasciviousness, &c.* (with reference to the vicious Heathen * *conversation*) by a villanous licentiousness, verse 19. (stolen in under pretence of Christian liberty, but being indeed the basest * *submission*) and by μολοματὰ τῶ κόσμου, the *pollutions of the Heathen world*, that is, of the Nations, or Gentiles, verse 20. (which the knowledge of Christ was designed to turn out, but complying and mixing with it, was the vilest and most damning condition that could befall any, vers. 21, 22.) and at last by a κόλλυμα βυβόρου the most *swinish wallowing in the mire* of all uncleanness. And if

* Vid. exort.
p. 139.
p. 139.
p. 139.
p. 139.

* The
p. 10.
p. 10.
p. 10.

you would know who these *unclean hereticks* were, (which Christianized all the villanies of the old Idol-worships) referred to in this and other places of the *Epistles*, I shall not positively define, but leave it indifferently between the *Gnosticks* and the *Nicolaitans*, the *Gnosticks* covertly * named 1. *Tim.* 6. 20. (it seems they were then a creeping in at *Ephesus*) and professedly declaimed at *Tit.* 1. under the title of the *Cretian evil beasts*, and *slow bellies*, vers. 12. and *μυρταδοφθοι*, polluted persons, vers. 15. and *ἀπομάρτυς* abominable, and such as by their works deny the faith, vers. 16.

For, that these (being called to *πνευματικὴ καθαρισμὸς* purification, and not to *uncleanesse*, that is, being by their conversion to Christianity obliged to forsake those carnall lusts) did *abuse the Grace of God* (that is, the light and mercies of the Gospel) to *wantonnesse*, *ἐκ διαπορεύσεως*. Jude vers. 4. (which that it belongs to this matter in hand will appear by the parallel assigned them, vers. 7.) that is, used it as an *occasion* to commit, or *protection* to continue in such sinnes, that they were guilty of strange prodigies of filthinesse, and retained in their *Sacraments* some *Symbols* of them, I had rather should be learnt from *Epiphanius*, then from this paper. Of them this is sufficiently known, that perswading themselves, that they were the *Children of God*, they thought they might wallow in all filthinesse, and be no more polluted by *it* than the *Sinne* beams by the dunghill on which they fall ; And against that doctrine of theirs it is that some interpret that of Saint *John* [*that he which is born of God cannot sin, because he is born of God*] that is, cannot sinne upon that head or score, to signifie that their *being born of God* can be no patent or security for their sinning.

As for the *Nicolaitans* which had their names from *Nicholas* the *Deacon* in the *Acts*, and their *sensuall* practices from his example (as might appear by the vile passages that Saint *Jerome* and others relate of him) I shall not need to say more then what we find mentioned of them, *Apoc.* 2. as first, that their works were odious to God, vers. 6. then secondly, that it was a *sect of doctrine among Christians* (as odious as it was) vers. 15. and it will not be unseasonable to pray, that God will keep all *Sectaries* from the like. Thirdly, that it was the same doctrine that *Balaam* taught *Balaac* to bring the *Israelites* to a curse, when nothing else could do it, vers. 14. and that fourthly, not onely specified in the story to be *whoredome with the daughters of Moab*, *Numb.* 25. but in this place particularly mentioned *τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἑσθλαῖς*, *καὶ πορνείᾳ*, eating things offered to Idols, and fornication; it seems the former of those, the *Idol-feasts*, was wont to be previous and preparatory to the latter, (and Saint *Hieromes* relation of *Nicholas* witnesseth the truth of the parallel) and therefore of the seven precepts of the *Sonnes of Noah*, mentioned in the *Apostles* Councell in the *Acts* (required

red of all *profelytes* that came in to *Judaisme*, and so by way of *compliance* at that time, prescribed to all the *Gentiles* that became *Christians*) the two first were those of *abstinence from meats offered to Idols*, and from *fornication*, *Acts* 15. 29. and the former of them, vers. 20. called ἀλισγματα τῶν εἰδωλῶν, the *pollutions or abominable villanies in those Idol-worships*, as in *Hesychius* ἀλισγμάτα is exprest by μετάνησις τῶν μαζῶν θυσιῶν, *participation of their abominable* (or as he renders ἡμεῖς ἀναθάρτα) *unclean sacrifices*, and the second περιεῖα *fornication*, being all one with the ערוּת עֲרִיבָה *de refectione nuditatum*, all uncleanness in generall contains *adultery, incest*, and all *unlawfull lusts*. And that will give an account why those εἰδωλῶντα should be so forbidden in the *Acts* (it seems for that danger of unclean finnes so commonly annex to the *Idol-feasts*, as will appear, *Psal.* 106. 28. and *Numb.* 25. 1. 3.) and yet be counted of as perfectly *indifferent things* by Saint *Paul* 1. *Cor.* 8. viz. being separated from all danger of that unclean appendage. Fifthly, of these *Nicolaitans* works it is there added, that unless they be *straight reformed*, *God will come quickly upon that Church of Pergamus*, vers. 16. and that *coming* signifies a *fatal blow*, which was not onely observable to have fallen upon the *seven Nations*, on *Sodom*, on most of the great *Monarchies* of the world, for the revenge of this provoking sinne, (*Idolatry* thus heightened with this addition of *villany*) but even more then one of those *seven Christian Churches* may be thought to have been involved in that *guilt*, and *ruine*; even this of *Pergamus*, and the next of *Thyatira*, vers. 20. which sinne being described by *Jezabel* making her self a *Prophetesse*, and *teaching and seducing Christians*, πορεύεσθαι καὶ εἰδωλῶντα φάγειν, *to commit uncleanness, and to eat things offered to Idols*, (in the sence before mentioned) and by βᾶν Σατάν *depths of Satan*, vers. 24. she is said to have *time* given her for the reformation of this villany, vers. 21. and not making use of it, to have been *delivered up to destruction*, vers. 22.

§ 32. All this I have said, and might adde much more, to clear this truth, that there were such *Idols* for *new converts* to take heed of, in those dayes, such *carnall Gospellers*, that retained that part of the *Heathen Idolatries*, which flesh and bloud was most apt to be taken with, when the worshiping of *Images* was cast out. And if that villainous piece of *Heathenisme* which (by Gods desertion, and that thick long darknesse, (wherein they lived) lay before the coming of Christ, as an hideous sinne at once and judgement on those barbarous times, cannot yet (by sixteen hundred years of full light, and by all Christs precepts for all kind of *purity* of the very heart) be exorcized, or mortified amongst us, and if still our ears are open to every sect of hypocritically professors, though never so wild and ignorant, that

that brings any liberty, or proffer of carnality along with it, then sure is the title of *Christian* but ill bestowed on us, we are still the grossest *Idolators* in the world; and so are in all reason to expect the most exemplary punishments, which fell on them, be it the portion of *Sodom*, a judgement rained down immediately, a kind of *fire* and *brimstone* from heaven, (such are our strange, *groundlesse, irrational* destructions wrought upon one another at this time, which no man living can tell from whence they came; which is a sure argument that there is somewhat of the *Δείον* in it, either as that signifies the *divine* hand of *God*, visible in the judgement, or as *Δείον* signifies also that * *brimstone* fire that comes with *thunder*) or be it the judgement that fell upon the Nations for those *villanies*, a *πυρρὴ ὁρμή*, or *fi- nall destruction* of a profane polluted people.

Having gone thus farre in our inquest on occasion of the *origination* and *use* of the word *Idolatry*, especially in the *old* and *new Testament*, and found somewhat meant by it in the *New*, which is not so vulgarly taken notice of, I shall desire to prevent a mistake, and do therefore professie not to have designed these observations to that end, that the sinne of *Idolatry* so declaimed at in the Scripture, should be thought to signifie nothing else, but those acts of *villany* in the *Heathen mysteries*; or because the *worshiping of images* is not so frequently spoken of in the *New Testament*, that therefore it should be no sinne now under the Gospell. That it is a grosse and provoking sinne in them that are guilty of it, there is no question, and the affirmation of Text is clear, that there is no *communication or reconcilableness betwixt the Temple of God and Idols*, 2. *Corinth. 6. 16.* and that the guilt of that sinne among the Nations, *worshiping those senselesse Deities*, was so great, that it provoked God by way of just punishment to *deliver them up to those infamous vile affections. Rom. 1.*

I shall now therefore proceed from the more *criticall* to the *reall material* part of the discourse, and inquire into the nature of that sinne, merely as it is a *worship of Idols, or images*. In which matter you may first observe some considerable difference between the two sorts of *resemblances*, which have been usuall among men. Some *extantes, corporeall figures standing out*, γυνῆ, statues, *graven images*; others onely *representations*, or *pictures*, painted on windows, tables, chalices, &c. The former of these were most used by (because fittest for the turns of) the *Heathens*, being by them (through the commodiousnesse and advantage of their *bodily shapes*) conceived to be more capable of *animation* by those gods of which they were the resemblances. Thus is it the known divinity of * *Trismegistus* (or some body in his disguise) that *Statues or Simulachra were the bodies of their gods*, who by some magicall ceremonies of consecration (whence it

* Οὐκ ἐπὶ πλὴν-
τος τῷ κατὰ
νὴν πνεύματι
ὁδῶντι τὸ
ἔχοντι ὁ κα-
τανοῶν τὴν
ψαῖον. *Hebr.*

§ 33.

§ 34.

* *Aug. de
civ. dei. l. 8.
c. 23.*

seems to be that, *Galath. 5. Apoc. 1. 22. Caspaxia's sorceries*, are joyned with *idolatries*) were forced to * joyn themselves to them, to *animate* them, to assume, and inhabit those earthen bodies as it were. To which fancie perhaps the *Apostle* may relate, when he tels the *Christians* that their *bodies are the Temples of the Holy Ghost*, that God is powerfully in them, though not in those dumbe images. And * *Proclus* relates it as their opinion generally, that *the gods were by their favour and help present in their images*, and thereon is grounded the old relation of the *Tyrrians*, who on a fear that *Apollo* would forsake them, bound his image fast with *golden Chains*, and that other of the *Athenians* who *clipt the wings of the image of victory*, that she might not fly away from them. And so the *Sicilians* in * *Cicero* complaining that they had no gods in their *Isle*, give this reason for it, that *Verres* had taken away all their *Statues*. And so the *Idol* thus raised above its naturall pitch by bringing down some *athereall spirit* into it, (*viz.* the god whose image it was) became a god in their opinion, and was thought able to hear, see, speak, help, do any thing that belonged to a Deity. Thus doth *Nero* in *Suetonius* pretend to know things to come by the instruction of such an *icuncula* or little image. So *Trismegistus* tels us of speaking Images, and *Historians* the like of *Memnon's Statues*, and so *Labans Teraphim*, being supposed to have had a spirit included in them, went for *Labans gods*. And it is not improbable by the Text that the *Israelites Calf* was by them thus counted of, as an image which upon *Aarons* consecration was thus animated by God, and so fit to go before them, to be their conductour in *Moses* absence, whom they knew to be moved and directed by God.

§ 35.

It is clear, this *Calf*, these *gods* as they call them, were by them desired to supply *Moses* place, and though the conjecture be not improbable, that the figure of it was the same with the figure of a *Cherub* (which God after appointed to be in the *Tabernacle*, *Exod. 25. 18.* and of which it is possible *Aaron* might then have some intimation) as may appear by comparing *Ezek. 1. 10.* with chap. 10. 14. where that which is the face of an *Oxe*, or *Calf* in one place, is the face of a *Cherub* in the other, and the ground of this resemblance in reference to *Josephs* providing for the *Egyptians*, and also for his father and brethren in the famine (whereupon his *scutcheon* is said to be an *Oxe*, agreeable to that prophecy of him, *Deut. 33. 7.* his glory is like the firstling of a bullock, as *Minutius* for his care of feeding the souldiers in a dearth was honoured by the *Romanes* with a golden *Oxe*, *Liv. 1. 4.* and as *Suidas* relates of King *Apis* that he fed the *Alexandrians* in a famine, and therefore was honoured after death with a *Temple* and an *Ox* in it) yet was this image worshipt by them (as appears by their

sacri-

* Neque autem
neque autem
argenti-
que materia
quibus signa
consecrantur,
esset. Deos de-
cernimus,
sed eos ipsos
in his colli-
mus, quos
dedicatio in-
fert sacra, et
fabrilibus
efficit inhabi-
tare simi-
litudinis. Ar-
nost. cont.
Gent. l. 6.

* De sacris, &
M. S.

* De sacris,
in Q. Caeli.

(*sacrificall feast and celebration*) and so used just as the *Egyptian Idols*, which were accounted as so many gods. And therefore the question which is ordinarily made, [whether the Israelites *worship this Calf*, or onely *God in this Calf*] may well enough be superseded, and the resolution be sufficiently clear, that they worship not *God* onely, but the *idol-calf* also, (and so I am sure their successors have conceived, which talk so much of a *grain* of the *Calf* in every judgement they have suffered ever since) and so doted upon the specious *Idol*. and were transported with their sensuall way of worshiping it, that God was quickly almost lost, and forgotten amongst them. *their heart going back into Egypt*, where such like images had been in fashion and were wont to be worshiped.

What is now said of this will belong also to the erection of *Jeroboams Calves*; of which though it may not be improbable, that they also were the imitation of the *images of the Cherubim* in the *Temple*, and so the same of setting them up in *Dan* and *Bethel* an act of *Schisme*, designed on purpose by *Jeroboam* to keep open the great division in the State, 1. *Kings* 12. 26. yet was it not the guilt of *Schisme* alone, to which it was lyable, (as * *Moncaus* hath laboured to perswade) but having an addition of *sacrificing to those Calves* also, vers. 32. and the proclamation of [Behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt] vers. 28. (which intimates them to be set out by him to the people for so many *animated inspirited images*) no question but the guilt of *Idolatry* belonged to it, and that the divine censure. and character of *Jeroboams* sinne (that stuck so close to his posterity) importeth also.

The other *pictures* which are called *dimissa*, *depreffe*, a *plain painting* on a table, &c. without any *protuberancy*, or *bunching*, were not by the *Gentiles* thought so capable of receiving that *animation*. The distinction is *Maimons*; the first he calleth *הצורה בולטת* the *protuberant image*, the other *משוקעת* the *depreffe*, either drawn on a table in colours, saith he, or weaved in *hangings*. The former of these and not the latter, was it which was so strictly forbidden the *Jews* (and accounted as a *ὑψηλαὶον* of *polytheisme*, a token of the *worshipping* of many gods, (a *discriminative* note between the worshipers of the *one* true, and the *many false* Deities) because of that *Heathen* opinion, that such statues, or *protuberant* pictures were by *magick* made capable of these *ethereall spirits*; an abuse, of which the *depreffe pictures* were not so capable. And hence it is (not without reason) that learned men that conceive the second commandment to prohibit none but the former (peculiarly the *graven image*) and to that purpose read that which follows. by way of *explication*, not of *disjunction*, [*graven image, the likeness*] &c. (as it is *Deut.* 5. 8. in the *Hebrew*,

§ 36.

* *Adon*
Pharisa.

§ 37.

brow, not, [*or the likenesse*] do extend it even to the *making*, or *having* any such, and not onely to the *worshiping* of them.

§ 38.
* c. 3. 12.

Thus, saith * *Maimon*, it is forbidden to make *images* though it be onely לְנוֹי *for ornament*; but then that, saith he, is to be understood of the *images*, that *bunch out*, or are *embossed*; but for the *painted* or *woven* מוֹתָרוֹת אֵלוּ they are not unlawfull: and he specifies very nicely that a *ring* that hath for a *seal* the figure of a Man, if it be *gibbons*, or swelling out, is not it self lawfull to be *worne*, but yet it is *lawfull to seal* with it, because the *impreffion*, in that case, is *hollow*, not swelling out, and on the other side if the seal be *depreffe*, or *hollow*, it is lawfull to *weare*, but not to seal with it, chap. 3. §. 13. It is true this he restrains again, that none (in this matter onely for *ornament*) is forbidden, but the figure of a *man*; but others in obedience to the words of the second command, extend it to the prohibition of all living *creatures* also, (onely the inanimate, such was the *Golden Vine* in the *Temple*, were excepted,) And truly it seemeth very probable, that to the Jews it was (whether by the force of the second commandment, or by some precept elsewhere, or by the *Tradition of the Elders*, I say not) conceived utterly unlawfull to have any such *images*, especially in their *Temples* or *places* of worship (unlesse in case of Gods particular command, as the *Cherubim*, and the *brazen Serpent*) yea and to bow in their *presence in any place*; for this will *Maimons* stating the severall cases convince to have been his opinion, and, as he conceived, the constant doctrine of the *Jews*. I am sure they are appointed to be *broken down*, *Exod.* 34. 13: and examples there are of the peoples practice that way, both in the story of *Herods Trophies*, and the *Eagle* set up by him over the gate of the *Temple*, and in many other particulars; And the *Greek Church* at this day, though it hath *pictures* good store, yet I think it hath none of these *embossed Statues* allowed in it (which yet the *Lutherans* use promiscuously, yea and clothe and adorn them too, and conceive not themselves to sin against any commandment of the law, because they do not *worship* them.)

§ 39.

The *reason* of this prohibition to the *Jews*, is by *Maimonides* again cleared to be, not for any naturall primitive sinfulness in an *image* of a man &c. but onely for *caution*, (and therefore *within the veil* which the eyes of the people were not permitted to enter, God himself appoints the *Cherubims* to be set up, and *Solomon* graved *Cherubims* upon the walls of the *greater house*, 2. *Chron.* 3. 7. that is, in the *body* of the *Temple* I conceive, because none but the *Priests* did come in thither, *Luke* 1. 8, 9.) to *hedge* and *keep* them from all danger of falling into the *Heathen* *worships*, and upon the obligation of the words of that *Text*, *Exod.* 34. 12. *beware &c. lest it be a snare unto thee.*

And

And therefore it is further resolved, that all those images were unlawful to them, (and perhaps none but these,) wth *Idolators used in their worship*; and so the specifying of the three sorts in the *Commandment* may argue, [*the things in heaven, in earth, in the waters*], from each of which the severall follies of men had fetched their Deities. To instance onely in the *last* and lowest of them, that the *Crocodiles* in the river were so accounted of among the *Egyptians* is clear (among many other) by one notable relation in *Max. Tyr. dial. 29*. There was a woman, saith he, in *Egypt* that nursed up a young *Crocodile*, and was counted a mighty happy person *ὡς τὸν προσκολλημένην θεῷ, as one that had brought her God to hand*, and kept it tame by her; this woman, saith he, had a sonne *ἡλικίας τοῦ θεοῦ, of the age of the God*, and when they grew up to some bignesse, the *Crocodile* killed and devoured the child, *ἡ δὲ γυναῖς ἐπαυδαῖτο τὸν υἱὸν τῷ θεῷ, ὡς περὶ τοῦτον δέγον ἐπέσιον διῶ, she in her mourning for her sonne pronounced him blest in this death, that he was thus offered up a present to her domestick God*. And they which could worship such wild vulture Gods, could not much be blamed, if they deified every onion in the garden, much more every starre in the skie, which sure deserved their acknowledgement much better then the vulture of the sea the *Crocodile*, had done.

Agreeable to this interdict of *Caution* among the *Jews* (extended onely to those images which were so abused by the *Heathens*) is the designe of those *Homilies* in our book, concerning the *peril of Idolatry*, which though they acknowledge that * *images be of themselves things indifferent*, and that * *men are not so ready to worship a picture on a wall, or in a window, as an embossed and gilt image set with pearl and stone*, and professe (in the beginning of the third part of the Homily) that *all which is said, is thus meant*, [*in that we be stirred and provoked by images to worship them, and not as though they were simply forbidden by the new Testament, without such occasion and danger*] and count it a *piece of Superstition*, and scrupulosity to abhorre all pictures, as images of princes, &c. which, saith that Homily, *Christ saw on the Romane coyns and reprehended them not, nor condemned the art of painting and image-making as wicked of themselves*, p. 44. yet, in respect of the frequency of that sinne in those times of the so eminent danger that images in Churches would be worshipped, and all possible means would not be probable to secure the use of them against that danger, they do with great earnestnesse exhort the not setting them up, especially in *country Churches*, where the number of the ignorant may much enhance that danger; and it may be observed that in the *Articles* of our Church we make acknowledgement of that whole book of *Homilies*, that they were *usefull and profitable for those times*, wherein (being so lately gotten

§ 40.

§ 41.

P. 10. lin. 1.
P. 27. near
the end.

gotten out of Popery where *image-worship* was so ordinary) the danger was so great of falling back, upon every temptation, to that sinne. And though the *Homilies* be wary and carefull to prevent another contrary danger, *lest any private persons under colour of destroying images should make any stirre or disturbance in the common-wealth.* and therefore addeth * that it must alwayes be remembred that the redresse of such publick enormities pertaineth to the *Magistrate*, and such as be in authority onely, and not to private persons, yet to those whose duty it is to take care for the people that they be godly as well as quietly governed, the exhortation is very instantly pressed, that (after the pattern of *Hezekiah*, &c.) they perform this part of their duty, viz. that as *Hezekiah* did in the case of the *brazen Serpent*, so the *Magistrate* whensoever he sees images to be abused, or the people apt to worship them, think himself obliged in conscience to appoint them to be removed in care of the honour of God, and the peoples good. And this is certainly very good and wholesome doctrine, and nothing more reasonable, then that he which is defendour of the *Faith*, should take care to defend the impotent seducible weakling (I mean not the railer at *images*, who sure is of all others the safest from that danger of *worshipping them*, and consequently disclaims any want of that fatherly caution,) from such imminent peril (when any such there is) of this *image-worship*. And that this is the Supreme *Magistrates charge*, and belongs not to any inferiour, further then to execute what he commands, might be evidenced from the doctrine and censures of the Church, in the case of the *iconoclaste*, if it were now pertinent. To this I shall onely adde (that which I conceive other mens experience of themselves will incline them to believe) that the *worship of images* or any thing but *God*, is not a thing to which *English Protestants* for these late years (especially the *Catechized* and knowing) have generally had any strong temptations, at least not such in any comparison, as immediately after the *reformation*, the minds of men (before used to such ignorant vanities) were subject to. And I doubt not but many men that have frequented Churches, and places where pictures have been, can sincerely upon examination of their memories, say with me, that they are not conscious to themselves, that they ever found themselves under any inclination or danger of falling into any act of *image-worship*. Which consideration, if it be true, (as I cannot but perswade my self it is) will take off much from the necessity of continuing those strict cautions (of not permitting any kind of *image* in any Church, and the like) which some other times or inclinations of men might make more necessary, and consequently take off much from the odium which the way of *adorning some Churches with imagery* hath lately laine under.

What

What was said of having embossed *images* among the Jews may be enlarged also to bodily *gestures*, whether *religious* to God, or *civil* to our superiours, in any place where images are; for both these seem to have been interdicted the *Jews*, at least by them to have been accounted unlawfull (as will at large appear by *Maimonides* in the book forecited) though the heart were never so farre from *worshipping* the *images*. But then though the *Jews* were under that strict restraint, yet *aliens*, *profelytes*, of other nations, were not bound to that strictnesse; but *Naaman* is permitted by the prophet to go with his Heathen Master into the house of Rimmon, and (when the Master worships there, and leans upon his hand) to bow himself in the house of Rimmon, 2 Kings 5. 18. upon this ground, first, that he never went into the Idol-temple, but to wait upon his Master in the office which he had. Secondly, that he professed himself to all, (even to that heathen Master, and those that were in his Court) to be a worshiper of none but of the true God, and to that end carried two mule-loads of earth out of Palestine with him, v. 17. in honour of him whose name was great there, and to build an Altar, according to the prescript, *Exod.* 20. 24. by which it was sufficiently clear to the beholders, (as by an interpretative protestation) that, when his Master worshiped, he onely bowed, and then his bowing was onely civil to his Master the King, not religious to Rimmon or Saturn, or his image there; And therefore to his question whether God will be offended with him in that matter, the Prophet answers him with a [*go in peace.*] I cannot think so irreverently of the Prophet, as that he should make that answer ironically to his new convert (any more then I can believe *Naamans* scruple belonged onely to the former part of his life (reading it in the prater sense) for sure that had been guilty of the *worshipping the Idol*, and not onely *bowing in the house of Rimmon*) but that he meant in earnest, what alone the words import, that in thus doing, and no more, he need not fear that he should be a breaker of that Law, which in this particular was not given to him, or any, but those of that Nation, or people of the *Jews*; For it is an ordinary observation, that *Gentiles* or *aliens* were received in among the *Jews* under a double capacity, either as *Profelytes of Justices*, to submit to the whole *Judaicall* law, to every rite and positive precept of it; or else onely as *Profelytes of the Gates* (and such was *Naaman*) to submit to the seven precepts of the Sonnes of Adam and Noah (and no more) among which the זרה עברה *על* of the strange worship, or Idolatry was one, and so a necessity imposed on them of casting off the Idol-worship, but not of not bowing to the King in the presence of an Idol, unlesse the case were of such a gesture that in that nation were performed to none but the deity in worship (the reason that the *Grecians* refused once to bow to the

Persian King, because that reverence was there performed to none but *God* which was not the manner then in *Syria*, but veneration and even prostration paid to the *King* as well as to *God*. Thus much I have said on occasion of the first sort of *Images*, the *embossed* and *protuberant* among the *Jews*; and shall not need to descend to a more particular survey of the second sort, it being already manifest that the reason that prevailed to prohibit the very *having* the former among the *Jews*, did not even in their opinion extend unto the latter. And for *worshipping*, though the latter were not among them so likely to occasion that sinne, yet if any *Jew* should have been so mad to worship any such image, the *sinne* it is acknowledged, would have been as great, as that which was committed with the *grosser corporeous object*, and so will it hold infallibly among all others.

Thus farre have I gone on the ancient old Testament notion of an *Idol*, and the *Idolatry* forbidden there. It may now be fit to proceed one step further, and to enquire whether there may not possibly be in the *Christian Church*, such a sinne as *Idolatry*, that is, whether he that acknowledges the *Christians God*, and worships no heathen *Deity*, much lesse *image* of such, may not yet possibly fall into that sinne of *Idolatry*, as that signifies *worshipping* somewhat else beside the *invisible God*, be it an *image of God*, or else a *Saint*, or *Angel*, or somewhat else clothed in some respect or relation to *God*.

And here will be no necessitie or use of drawing a formall charge (in this matter) against any particular man or Church, or possibility of defining (from *books* especially) which (or whether any whole) Church or sort of *Christians* at this day) are guilty of this sinne, because it is to be expected that the *writings* of *prudent* men will be so cautious, as not to accuse themselves in this matter; as even now I gave you an example from *Maximus Tyrim* a *Platonick* heathen in the description of it among the *Gentiles*. Yet because * some number of sober men which have lived in the *Roman* Communion hath given me occasion, I shall interpose my wish, that the care which by their writers is taken for excuse of the *doctrine* of the learned, were used for the directing and examining of the *practices* of the *ignorant* also.

I shall therefore set down in *these* what may, according to the grounds laid in the former part of this discourse, conclude a *Christian* guilty of *Idolatry*, and leave every mans own conscience (and among all others the *Romanists*) to examine, and as occasion shall be, to accuse himself, and every *Christian* to *advise* and *exhort* (but withall to abstain as much as is possible from *judging*) other men.

And first, I conceive that he that (by *doctrine*, and *action*) attributes to

§ 43.

§ 44.

* *Dicitur, di-
visque non
alter vene-
ratur quam
Deum ipsum,
&c. Iud. Viv.
in Aug. de
civ. l. 8. c. ult.
vid. Cossind.
consult. de
imag. Polyd.
Virg. de re-
rum invent.
l. 6. c. 13.*

§ 45.

§ 46.

they fall into a prohibited act, by neglecting the onely *Christian* course of making our addresses onely by *Christ* to *God*, which I conceive is the meaning of *μὴ πρὸς ἄνθρωπον*, *Col. 2. 18.* Let no man *deprive you of that Christian bravium or prize,*] the peculiarity of privilege of coming unto *God* by *Christ* onely. The same will be said of *offering sacrifice, incense, or the like* unto them (acts of worship and so peculiar to *God* (making *vows or swearing* by them, asking *grace, pardon of sinnes, or salvation* of them.

§ 48.
* *Via Con-*
est. Laod.
can. 35. p.
312. & 20.
sur. in can.
stam, &
Justellm
Cod. eccl. un-
vers. p. 263.
§ 49.

As for the * *Angelici* in the primitive *Church*, who conceived that nothing was to be asked of *God* but what was by the petitioner committed first to one *Angel*, then from him to another, and so by those many degrees brought to *God*, this may be thought a first rise of the sinne of *Angel-worship*, somewhat parallel to that, which we gave you from *Maimonides* of the Heathen Idolatry.

What hath now been said, must be taken with some *caution*, and it is this, that to bow to an *Angel* appearing to any man, (which civility we pay to any *superiour*) would not come under this *censure*. A consideration which hath made some wise men think that the *Angels* refusing of worship at Saint *Johns* hands in the Revelation, chap. 19. 10. was not the rejecting it as an act of *Idolatry* (or any kind of siene if it had been accepted) but as an evidence of the *Angels* acknowledging himself *Johns* Fellow servant (the reason which is there rendred in the Text) and so not *superiour* to him in that office. But to this it may be said, that the *Angels* admonition [*worship God*] that follows, may possibly argue that *John* took the *Angel* for *God* appearing, and accordingly worshiped him, and therefore I shall not define. But then still for any other reverence or bowing, but that of *divine adoration*, there is no question but it may be performed to a *man*, when we meet him, and then much more unto an *Angel*; And that any *gesture of reverence* shall passe for *divine adoration*, will, I conceive, be onely in the power of *God*, and each mans own soul to define, the same outward act being (without any danger) performable both to *Man* and *God*, and nothing but the intention of the person making the difference. Much lesse will the *worshipping* of *God*, when an *Angel* appears to us, (as supposing *God* to be peculiarly present where those his *Satellites* or *Courtiers* appear) come under that charge, nor consequently doing it in the Church (peculiarly at the first * entrance into that *holy place*) where the *Angels* are supposed to be present (the *Angels* singing with us, saith *Chrysostome*, and *Angelus Orationis*, saith *Tertullian*, and the presence of whom in the Church is used by Saint *Paul*, as an argument for the decent behaviour of women in that place) as *Jacob* at the appearing of the *Angels* both put off his Shoes from

* *Vid. vew*
• the New
• *regioy,*
p. 21. &
p. 83.

from
ab
I
pea
Go
any
givi
posi
acce
tion
offic
T
ther
sed
her
thin
And
agai
thin
Y
dem
in h
ther
ers t
faith
ding
pole,
shipi
to pr
N
ricul
dy la
whol
the b
they
the g
stian
kept
besto
that

from his feet, and resolved that *God was in that place*, and that it was *no other but the house of God, or gate of Heaven.*

Nor will it be the sinne of Idolatry to beseech that Angel, (in case he appear to me) to joyne with me, or help me, or to commend my wants to God in his prayers, any more then it will be, to request the like favour of any fellow-*Christian* upon earth. The *Idolatry* is either in the heart, the giving him a *free unlimited* power, or in the actions *praying* to him, as supposing he had such power, and not the bare observing, (and reverencing accordingly) his *created power* or dignity, held from *God* by way of *dignation*, or desiring him, (when he comes within my reach) to discharge any office of charity to me.

The same may be said again of the *Saints in heaven*, that the *beseeching* them to bestow mercies upon me, the putting up those petitions to the *bles-sed Virgin*, &c. which are *terminated* in her self (as many *Forms*, if not her whole Office may appear to be) are, over and above the error of thinking her able to relieve them, acts parrallel to that old *Idolatry* also; And the thinking them to come to the knowledge of our *prayers* in *speculo* again, is a presumption in a matter of which *Scripture* hath told us nothing, and so may fall under the fore-mentioned *accusation*.

Yet so again, that if it were sure to any, that any *Saint* doth *bear* his demands, it were certainly no fault to *beseech* that favour of him, which were in his *free* power to bestow, and which we ordinarily demand of one another, that is, the joyning with, or for us, *assisting* and reinforcing our *prayers* to God. And supposing that they do not *bear* or *understand* what he saith, yet what guilt shall lie on him that thinks they do, and speaks accordingly to them, I omit now to define, because it is not to my present purpose, which was onely to enquire what is *Idolatry*, not *Folly*, what *Worshipping* or *praying* for help, to that which is not *God*, not speaking to them to *pray* for us which *cannot bear*.

Next for *images* either of *God*, *Christ*, or *Angels*, or *Saints*, many particulars may be resolved and avowed from the principles of discourse already laid, 1. That to conceive them able to *hear* and *help* by virtue of him, whose *image* they are, is a spice of that *heathen doctrine* of [*Images being the bodies of the gods*] (of their being animated by those whose images they were) which had among them its foundation in forcery, and then was the ground of Idol-worship; and it were happy if some * *Ignorant Christians* in some places, were not either willingly betrayed to, or uncharitably kept in this *barbarous rudeness*. So again will it be, 2. to *pray* to, or to bestow any act of *divine worship* on any such *Image* in any respect; For that supposes, and is built on the former conceit, and so a *worshipping* of that

§ 50.

§ 51.

§ 52.

* Non video in multis quod descri-mus sic inter eorum opinionem de sanctis & id quod Gentiles putabant de diis suis. Unde Virg. in Aeneid. de civ. lib. 6. c. 11.

which is not *God*; and what is that but *Idolatry*? I say, in any *respect*, and I mean with any distinction of *mediante imagine*, or *relative*, &c. For first it is an unreasonable thing for them, to whom the law is given, to make a *distinction* by which it may in some sense be lawfull not to keep it, such *distinctions* must be made by the *law-giver*, or else they are not safe.

3. Although it be to *God* also, *mediante imagine*, that is, first fastning my act of worship upon the *Image*, as the next or immediate object, and then *mediately* on *God*, this is clearly to worship the *Image*, though not the *Image* alone, and that must be *Image-worship*, or 2. though it be *onely relative* to the *Image* in relation to *God*, whose *Image* it is, this is again *worshipping that Image*, though not that *Image onely*, and that will not rescue the *worshipping* of an *Image* from the *censure* of *Image-worship*, any more then the affirming *Faith* to justify *instrumentaliter relative*, is not the affirming it to *justify*.

§ 54. As for the difference betwixt *image-worship* and *idolatry*, or *idol-worship*, if any such be pretended from the difference between *image* and *idolum*, it will not be worth our pains to examine it, because the *worshipping* of any thing which is not *God*, be it *image* or *idol*, *Christian* or *heathen* *similitude*, or any thing else, will fall under the guilt which now we speak of.

§ 55. But then 3. on the other side to worship *God* (and none but *God*) in a *Church* where *images* are (without so much as fixing the eye on them in the act of *adoration*) to use an *image* onely for ornament (in a kingdome were *Image-work*, *hangings*, and *pictures*, do passe for the noblest way of *adorning* those places which we most prize) to pray or to bow down to *God* (and to him onely) in a *Church* where such representations are set up (for *beauty*, or as an indifferent thing) without any the most inferiour degree of *worship* to them, (nay with a *protestation* of *renouncing* and *detesting* it) cannot be affirmed *Idolatry*, without either affirming *God* to be an *Idol*, or else [not *worshipping*] to be [*worshipping*] nor indeed be liable to any guilt, unlesse it be in order to *scandall*, which how farre it is to prevail, as we have already given an intimation, so the grounds of defining have sufficiently been laid down in another discourse.

Of Scandall.

§ 56. And so for the *reverent* usage of an *Image*, if it signifie no more then the using it *civily* for his sake, or in remembrance of him whose superstition it bears, especially if that be but a *privative reverence*, (a not using it vilely and contumeliously) or whatever may not come under the stile of a *positive* act of *adoration*, this is no part of *religious worship*, any more then the laying of a *Bible* on the *Table*, and not on the *ground*, &c. But if it be the actuall bestowing of *worship* on that inanimate thing, as on the next (though not last) object, I mean bestowing that *adoration* on the

Image

Image (though in a lower degree) in one act, which in another is given to God, *worshiping* the *Image* for Gods sake (the *relative worship*) or God *mediante imagine*, so that the *Image* be either the *object*, or part of the *object* of any one act of *worship*, it will fall under the censure of *Image-worship*.

Thus doth the *Capitular* of *Charles the Great* charge it on the *Bishop* of *Cyprus* in the *second Councell* of *Nice*, that he allows the *image* the same *worship* which belongs unto the *Trinity*; (and some learned *Papists*, *Aquinas*, *Bellarmino*, &c. have done little lesse) But he that will survey the *Greek* acts of that *Councell*, will find the *Capitular* mistaken. For when the *Greek* reads, *πῶς καὶ λατρεῖαν προσκύνειν μόνῃ τῇ τριδὶ ἀναπόμῳ*, *I perform* that *adoration of worship to none but the Trinity*, (and faith of the *images*, onely *δουλοῦμαι καὶ ἀσπάζομαι τιμητικῶς εἰκόνας*, &c. *I receive and embrace them reverently*) the *Capitular* reads it in a quite contrary sense, for having said, *Servitium adorationis quod Trinitati debetur, ei se redditurum garriverit* (which though it hath no great hurt in it, because the word [*Ei*] that follows, may apply it to *Trinitati*, and cannot referre to *images*, yet by [*garriverit*] it appears the *Capitular* did not take it so) it is added, *Servitium soli debitum Creatori, exhibere se fatetur Creaturis*, &c. Which is a plain calumny to that *Bishop*, and even contrary to the former part of the relation, (the *Latine* words cited from the *Councell*) if the [*Ei*] be taken notice of.

As for the very making of an *Image* of *God the Father*, who never was clothed in *flesh*, or *visible* form, if it be on designe so to represent him, or if (being made) it be received as a *resemblance*, or *Image* of him, this is a most irrational folly or mistake, for which there is no excuse; and though it be not *idolatry*, unless being thus made it be *worship* also, yet is it a direct contradiction to one great end of Gods prohibiting *Images*, *viz.* that all men be admonished that he is *invisible*; and it is worth observing, that the *ancient* of the *Heathens* themselves have resolved God to be so farre from any *visible* shape, that they would not allow the making any *image* or *picture* of him, Thus *Empedocles*, *ὅτε γὰρ ἀνδρῶν καὶ κατὰ, &c.* *No mans head, or feet, or knees, or other limmes to be conceived in God.* *Ἄλλα οὐδὲν ἢ πρὸ καὶ ἀόρατον, &c.* *but a sacred in-effable mind*; so saith *Plutarch* in *Numa*; that *Pythagoras* ἀόρατον καὶ ἀκίνητον καὶ νοητὸν ἀπειράμωτον εἶναι τὸ πρῶτον, *conceived God* (under the title of the *first*) *to be invisible*, &c. and that on those grounds *Numa* forbad the *Romanes*, *ἀνδρῶν περὶ καὶ ζώων μορφὴν εἶναι. οὐ νομίζειν, to conceive God to have the shape of any creature, or to have* *πλάσσειν εἰδὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, any formed image of God.* Which faith he, continued for one hundred and seventy years after the building of *Rome*, no ἀγάλμα ἑμμορφον, *image*

§ 57.

§ 58.

image of any form to be seen in their Temples. So saith Gerson, I remember, of the Temple of Peace in Rome, which it seems was of that first erection, *sine simulachro, sine imaginibus*, it had no resemblance or image in it. So Antiphanes of God; that he is not known by an image, nor likened to any thing, *ὅτι μὴ αὐτὸν ἰδὼς ἐκμαθεῖν ἔστιν οὐκ ὀρεῖται*, and therefore no man can learn him by the help of an image. And Philoponus in his Preface to Aristotle de Anima, conceives it very necessary to a pious man that would conceive, or pray to God as he ought, to study the *Mathematicks*, by the help of which he may be able to abstract and separate ἀπὸ ὕλης from matter, and so have a right notion of the deity. So agreeable to the general notion of wise Heathens (till a custome of sin had befottered them) was that of God himself to Moses, *Thou hast not seen any similitude at any time*, Deut. 4. 8. On which the making any image of him is prohibited. All which notwithstanding, if in the representation of a sacred story, there be set down any form, particularly an eye, a ray, a glory &c. not to expresse the person of God the Father, but to stand for him, not to signify any supposed likeness of him (which is impossible) but onely to present him to the mind of the beholder, a doing some action of his (which is in effect to do the very same thing in a Table, which the word *Jehovah* or God would do in a Book) I conceive not what charge could be laid on it, at least what degree or spice of *Idolatry*, unless I must be thought to worship the name of God, because I write or read it.

§ 59.

As for the resemblance of the man *Christ Jesus*, the bare expressing and not worshipping that form, that was so long visible on this earth, as this pretends no more to the painting of divinity, then the lines of a body can be thought to undertake to expresse the soul, (and so cannot be accused of that imposture) so will it not be lyable to any other charge with any that hath not resolved all pictures even of his own parents unlawfull. (unless it be perhaps in order to the danger of being worshipt by others, which consequently ought very prudently to be weighed and considered, before any such be set up in any place, as before was touched.)

§ 60.

And the same may be said of the pictures of holy men, the discourse wholly abstracting from worship, or designe, or thought of worship, as here it doth in our present consideration; To which purpose it is observable, that Calvin himself is by Doctor Reynolds produced, and avouched (against Bellarmine's contrary slander) to affirm the Images of Christ and the Saints, *non esse prohibitas simpliciter* not to be simply prohibited; and so in like manner, Luther, the Zuinglians, Melancthon, and the Magdeburgians, all detesting the worship of Images, but not the Images themselves. And so Illyricus and Peter Martyr also, who thinks the worship of images to be

be a prime part of *Popish Antichristianisme*, doth yet resolve, *Christi & Sanctorum imagines haberi rectè posse, modò ne colantur atque adorentur, that the images of Christ and the Saints may lawfully be had, so they be not worshipped.*

Once more to *worship the bread* in the *Sacrament*, must (wheresoever it is to be met with) certainly be *Idolatry* too, in the literall notation of the word, that is, the *worshipping* that which is not *God*. And for those that do this on any the subtilest ground, that by any *error* or *mistake* (be it never so *piously* taken up) do actually *worship* this *bread*, that first conceive it to be turned into the very *body of Christ*, and the *elements* after *consecration* to be no longer *bread* and *wine*, but very *Christ incarnate*, and thereupon do *worship* it. These I say, in case they be *mistaken*, and those *elements* be not so turned and *transubstantiated into Christ*, though they are not guilty of the sinne of *Idolatry* in all the aggravations that belonged to it among the *heathen*; being not guilty of their *πλῆθος*, the *acknowledgement of the many gods*, of which their *image worship* was an appendage, yet can I not free them from the charge of *worshipping an idol*, that is, somewhat which is not *God*, viz. a piece of *consecrated bread*, &c.

He that conceives this too sudden or severe a *censure*, may know that the *Papist-Doctours* are very ready to make confession of it themselves. *If the elements be not so changed*, saith *Costerus of Transubstantiation*, we *Papists* are the *meanest vilest kind of Idolaters* in the world, *worse* (as I remember he addes) *then the Laplanders that worshipped a red Cloth*. And there is no denying it upon that supposition, because it is part of the *supposition*, that what is so worshipt for *God*, is not *God*, and that is *עֲלִיל* an *Idol* in the *Scripture-sense*, which is all that I have now said.

And if it be replied that they *worship* nothing but what they conceive to be *Christ*, and consequently that the *Ignorance* and contrary persuasions which may be pretended for such acts in some men, particularly the *Romanists*, may plead much for them in *Gods Court*, (as we read that the *times of Ignorance God winked at in some Heathens*, though that was an *idolatrous ignorance*, so farre at least as not to deprive them and their posterity of all means of recalling them) I shall then answer, that so I shall hope (and pray) that it may do in this matter also, move *Gods mercy* so farre at least, as (if not to pardon the sinnes without *repentance*, yet) to give *grace* to work a *fight* and a *change* in such seduced *ignorants*.

And then putting the case anew, whether, If the *bread* in the *Eucharist*

§ 61.

§ 62.

§ 63.

§ 64.

be not *transubstantiate* (as , according to some other principles of the *Papists* , I conceive it near demonstrable that it is not , that I mention not the direct *contradictions* which are affirmed or implied in that doctrine) and yet *Costerus* and his friends think it is , supposing them to come *honestly* and *blamelessly* to these errors , If , I say , It be demanded , whether in this case [that their *ignorance* or *error* be grounded on *misunderstanding* of *Scripture*] This so *simple* and not *grosse* *ignorance* may serve for a sufficient *antidote* to allay the *poysen* of such a *sinne* (of *materiall* though perhaps in them not *formall* *Idolatry* , because if they were not verily perswaded , that it were God they professe , they would never think of *worshiping* it) I shall then answer , that of this matter I had onely temptation to make , and set the *question* (as before I had of *prayer* to *Saints* , supposing the petitioner to believe that they could hear him) but have now no necessity to define and satisfie it , being onely to consider what *idolatry* is , not how *excusable* *ignorance* or mistake can make it . Yet something it will not be amiss to adde to direct our *Charity* .

§ 65. That this *ignorance* , or false opinion will not make the *worshiping* of bread (remaining bread) to be the *worshiping* of none but God , I conceive it is plain , Or if it would , it would make the Heathens *worshiping* of an *image* , to be the *worshiping* of none but that God whose image it was , for they sure believed as much that that *image* was by *consecration* become the *body* of God , and animated by it , as any *Papist* believes *transubstantiation* . But whether this their error was as capable of *Apology* or *pardon* , being infused into them by their false teachers (which yet they thought to be true ones ,) and pretended to *Revelation* for it (saith *Maimonides*) as this which is taken up upon the words of *Scripture* , (though in a mistaken and (as I conceive) *impossible* because *contradictory* , sence) I shall now define no further , then by saying these two things .

§ 66. First , that the *Heathen idolatry* was the *worshiping* of the many false Gods first , and then of the *images* of them , (the former of which these men are not said , or thought to be guilty of) secondly , that the more the conscience believes this *error* to be a *truth* of Gods , and the more innocently it comes to that *believe* , the *easier* in all probability will the sentence be another day ; That *ignorance* or mistake which *sincerely* and *honestly* (without mixture of *carvall* principle , or designe , *prejudice* , or *passion* , &c .) founds it self in the word of God mistaken , (and would be laid aside , if sufficient instruction were offered) being very justly the object of our *pity* and our *prayers* , and neither of our *censure* ,

not scorn; And if it were merely a *speculative* error, and had not the happiness of some *impious practice* attending it, I should make the less doubt of its obtaining pardon at Gods hands; And howsoever I will hope, it may still (at that gracious tribunall) be farre from being *irremissible* to him, who hath reformed his other *known* sinnes, and for all *known* and *unknown* is truly *humbled*.

This manner of stating of this difficulty, may in reason perswade them that are concerned in it, to be willing to see and *reform* their *error*, if it be possible, or if *prepossession* have made it otherwise to them, yet in all *justice* not to expect of us, (who *professe* to *believe* that the elements are not transubstantiate, and that the humane nature of Christ is received and contained in, and confined to *Heaven*, till the day of *restitution* of all things; and this withall upon the same grounds, (I mean of *literall* affirmation of *Scripture*) on which they *professe* to believe that this is *Christs body*, and this neither contradicted by any other *Scripture*, nor implying any thing like a *contradiction* in reason, nor a *savagenesse* or a *sinne*, as Saint *Augustine* saith eating of Christs flesh doth, and that therefore it must not be *literally* interpreted) to *worship* that which we think a *creature*, or somewhat which is not God, or *anathematize* us and separate from our communion for not doing so.

As for our Church, which onely *adores Christ* in the *Sacrament* (as that signifies the *Action*, in which certainly *Christ* is) and not the *Elements* themselves, nor *Christs body* locally present under the shape of those *Elements*, (as certainly it cannot be, without either being no longer in *Heaven* or being in *more places* then one at once) which hath set the doctrine of that *Sacrament* in a most exquisite temper to satisfie all rationall *Christian* pretenders, in that most excellent *Catechisme* in the *Liturgie*, and in her practice allows the *Elements*, no more then a *reverent usage* proportionable to such *instruments* of *Gods worship*, (which is both justified by * *Amesius*, who assigns them a *singular reverence* in time of the use of them, and a *privative kind of reverence* after it) there can be no shew of charge against it for so doing, nor consequently for *kneeling* at the time of receiving the *Sacrament* which is onely a kneeling to God in prayer (which might be now further enlarged on, but that it hath had its place in another * *discourse*) unless it be a fault to *worship Christ*, or to choose that time or place to do it in the *lowlyest* manner, when, and where he is eminently represented by the *Priest*, and offered by God to us.

As for the *East*, or *altar*, or *syllables* of the name of *Jesus*, he that must think

§ 66.

§ 67.

* Case of
Confess. 431.* View of
the New
Direct. 27.

§ 68.

think them *worshiped*, by those who professe and protest to *worship God*, and none but *God*, (that way or on that occasion) must either be of a very *short discourse*, (like them in *Athenaus*, that hearing men crie *Zeu saviour God help*, when the neighbour *sneezed*, thought the very thing which we call *sneezing*, or else the *brain* from which it came, to be a *God so worshiped* by men) or else of a very *pettish spleen*, that can condemn the most blamelesse authorized practices, not onely of this *present particular*, but of the *ancient universall Church* (for the *worshiping God* toward the *East* was most eminently such) upon any the most irrationall jealousy, or dislike.

§ 70.

And so lastly for the *signe of the Crosse*, used by our Church in *baptisme*, which hath been by some cryed down under the title of *Idolatri*, two things it will not be amisse briefly to have observed, 1. That the same ground of *zeal* or *passion* that hath incited some men lately to charge it of a breach of the *second Commandment*, hath long since moved * one of the same *spirit* to accuse it as a sinne against the *other nine*, and to intitle his severall Chapters of the *Swearing*, *Sabbath-breaking*, *murder*, *adultery*, *stealing*, *false witnesse*, &c. and at last of the *concupiscence of the Crosse*, as well as the *idolatri* of it, the reasons being much alike for the whole charge. 2. That the *signing* with the *signe* of the *Crosse* in that *Sacrament*, is somewhat distant from that which the *Papists* use, and an act of departure from them, in *King Edwards second Liturgie*, more then had been in the *first Reformation*. The former custome was to crosse the child at the *Church-doore*, when it was brought to *Baptisme*, but this of ours as a mark of *initiation* or *reception into Christs flock*, immediately following *Baptisme*, and a kind of *severa*, or *military signe* that the person thus *consigned* into *Christs militia*, shall for ever after think himself obliged *manfully to fight*, &c. A change made merely out of compliance with them who were jealous of too great an inclination to *Popery*, and yet now charged with the *guilt* of that which it was on purpose designed to *decline*.

* Parker on
the Crosse.

§ 71.

I should not I conceive be thought in earnest, if I should go about to vindicate the use of the *Liturgy*, and of all *set forms* of prayer from this charge of *Idolatri*; It is true it hath been printed, that *words in a book are images*, and consequently that to *pray before a book*, or *use a book in prayer*, is *Idolatri*, or *Image-worship*. But till this argument be extended to all *words spoken*, as well as *written*, and so all vocall (though it be *extemporary*) prayer, condemned for *Idolatri* also, I shall not conceive that *disputer* to have believed himself, nor consequently give him or my reader the trouble of an *answer*. In stead of extending this enquiry

enquiry to the survey and vindication of those many other particulars ; to which the fancies or furies of this last yeare have affixed this charge ; all that I have now to adde is onely this , that I shall beseech God to give such *mistakers understanding* first , and then *Charity* , to make use of it to *edification* , and not to *destruction* , to the *reforming* their own sinnes and not *condemning* or *reproching* other mens *laudable* , at the least *innocent* actions.

Judge not , that ye be not judged of the Lord.

SOME few testimonies, which may tend to the clearing of the precedent Observations, but could not conveniently be put in either, in the Text or the margin of the Book, I have here thought fit to affix by way of Postscript.

Add. p. 11, ad lin. 32. in marg. Thus among the *Romanes* in their *illustrations*, Ἀρσωνδ' ἀρσυνὶ πλησιάζει σήσου τε πῦδας Ἀιχμῆς ἐν τέλει, *Sybil. orac. l. 3. p. 231.* and speaking of the Christians giving over *Idolatry*, ἐπὶ ἔργ' ἀνθρώπων χρύστα, &c.] it is added immediately, Κ' ἔδε παρὲς Ἀρσυνικὰς πῦδας μύθωνται ἀνάγνους, Ὅσα τε φοίνικας τ' &c. naming all the severall nations of the heathen world that were guilty of it , p. 264. and exhorting against *Idolatry*, εὐχῆτε λατρείας ἀδίκους ὅς. Μοιχείαν περὶ ὑλάζο, καὶ ἀκρίτην ἀρσυνὸν εὐνήν, p. 279. and that true pietie , as it is opposed to idol-worship, so to Ἀλλοτρίους κοίτης πέθ' αἰχμῆς, ὅς ἀρσυνὸν ὑβείς ἀπυχθίσιν εὐχαρίτε, l. 4. p. 287. & p. 296. and of the *Romanes* again, Μοιχεύει παρ' οἱ, καὶ παίδων μίξις ἀδίστα, p. 315. and so again, p. 332.

Add. p. 12. ad lin. 24. in marg. In this sense I conceive *Plato* used the word *πλιτ.* l. 9. where speaking of sensuall men , and comparing them to beasts, ρεπαζομένους καὶ ὀρχούμενους, *full fed and lascivious*, he adds, ἔνεα τις τῶν πλεονεξίας κωλύοντες καὶ λαμπρίζοντες, &c. Or if you will needs have the notion of *covetousnesse* continued , yet I conceive the company that the word is so oft found in the New Testament, will have such an influence on it, that it shall belong to that αἰχμηκία, *getting wealth by these unclean prostitutions*, which sure is expressed by the *Author* of the *Sybylin oracles*, l. 3. p. 231. where immediately after the mention of those *impurities* is subjoyned, Ἀιχροβίῳ οἰλοχρημοσύνῃ, χαμικέρδει πύτῳ.

Add. p. 14. ad l. 4. in marg. to the word ὑπερβαλύν. So in the *Sybil. or.* is this sinne expressed by ὑπερβαλύνει ἀδίκους. l. 3. p. 231. and the men guilty of it called ὑπερβαλῶν καὶ ἀνάγνοι, pag. 232. (the word ὑπερβα-

λοι, noting all immoderate desires or attempts, πάν ὑπέρματρον, saith *Phavorinus* and as it is immediately specified, καλεῖται κακοί, καὶ πάντα κακοί So in *Phocylides*, Μὴ γὰρ ὑπερβίης, ὅ' ὑπερβασίης' ἀλαργίῃ, doth seem to import also.

Add. ad p. 15. l. 10. in marg. So in the *Sibyll Oracles*, l. 2. p. 172. with Ἀισίην περιπύοντες, ἀναιδέην ποδύοντες, *those that had put off all shame,* are joyned ἀρπαγδαί, *ravishers*, and pag. 216. with λεκτρολόγοι εἰδωλόγραμμα, δὲς κακὸς ἐν σέρνοισιν ἐν μαυανήδρῳ δισφῶ (which sure belongs to the *fury of inordinate lusts*) there is joyned Ἀσπύζοντες, ἀναιδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντες, *rapes and shamelesse lusts*, and σέρεπ κρυβίαις, *secret loves*; and δέξαι σπρίσεται ὄλιον, *the judgements of Brimstone* (the portion of *Sodom* for such finnes) follows in the end of that Book. All which passages, though they cannot be thought to have that *antiquity or author*, to which they pretend, are yet by our Countrey man *Joannes Opsopaus*, or *Cook*, with great reasons supposed to be as *ancient* as the *Emperour Commodus*, and so will be worthy our heed, for a matter of no greater weight then is now laid on them.

F I N I S.

ba-
in
im-
72.
e,
-
the
per-
id a
S-
fa-
ny,
ny,
ony
ster